

REMARKS

At the outset, the Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated October 4, 2005 and the subsequent Office Action dated May 31, 2006 have been received and their contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-3 and 7 were amended and new claims 8 and 9 were added in response to the October 4, 2005 Office Action. Accordingly, claims 1-9 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated October 4, 2005, claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 2, and 7 were amended to more clearly set forth the subject matter. However, a response to the rejection regarding claims 4-6 was inadvertently absent in the response filed March 6, 2006. More specifically, the Office Action asserts that claims 4-6 are indefinite because "it is not clear how can the steps of sensing and calculating be repeated if the sensing step is required to be conducted at the specific time of the washing course and the calculating step is based of the sensing step." The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 is not limited to performing the "sensing" and calculation" steps only once. Claim 4 recites repeating the "sensing" and "calculating" steps "to obtain an average rate of water level reduction." Claim 4 does not recite or suggest performing the sensing step (claim 1) and the repeated sensing step (claim 2) simultaneously (i.e. at the same predetermined time). It is clear that in order to obtain an average rate of water level reduction, some time must elapse, no matter how small or how large, between the "sensing" in claim 1 and the "sensing" in claim 4.

Likewise, some time must elapse between the “calculating” in claim 1 and the “calculating” in claim 4. For at least the aforementioned reasons, the Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 of claims 4-6.

The Office Action dated October 4, 2005, also rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,842,929 to *Kim et al.* (hereinafter “*Kim*”). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, “the reference must teach every element of the claim.” The Applicant respectfully submits that *Kim* does not teach every element recited in claims 1-7. More specifically, claim 1 recites a washing machine control method which includes “calculating a water level reduction rate based on the set first water level and the sensed second water level” and determining an optimum water re-supply amount “by comparing the calculated water level reduction rate to a predetermined value.” *Kim* does not teach at least these features.

While the Applicant agrees *Kim* does disclose a water absorption rate, it does not specifically teach calculating a water level reduction rate based on a first water level and a second water level. Nor does *Kim* teach determining an optimum water re-supply amount by comparing a calculated water level reduction rate to a predetermined value. If the Examiner disagrees, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner specifically point out the column and line numbers where *Kim* teaches these specific features. Otherwise, the Applicant submits that *Kim* does not anticipate claims 1-7 and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Furthermore, the Applicant added new claim 9. The Applicant submits that claim 9 recites a washing machine control method which includes “calculating a water level reduction rate by comparing the first water level and the second water level over time” and “determining a

water re-supply amount by comparing the calculated water level reduction rate to a predetermined value" which are not disclosed in the cited references.

The application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: June 23, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Mark R. Kresloff

Registration No.: 42,766

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant